

REMARKS

Claims 2, 5-6, 9-12, and 36-38 are pending.

At the outset, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for graciously extending Applicants' representative an interview to discuss the rejections in the Final Office Action. During the interview, the propriety of the Final Office Action was discussed. More specifically, under MPEP § 706.07(h), a final rejection after the filing of a Request for Continued Examination is only proper when no new ground of rejection was presented in the Rule 114 Submission. However, on page 7 of the Final Office Action, it is acknowledged that the Rule 114 Submission filed on April 6, 2010, introduced a new ground of rejection necessitated by claim amendments made in the Submission. Accordingly, it is submitted that the outstanding Office Action should not be deemed a Final Office Action.

Withdrawal of the finality of the Final Office Action is respectfully requested.

Also, during the interview differences between the claimed embodiments and the cited references were discussed. A discussion of these differences is set forth below. At the conclusion of the interview, the Examiner indicated that the decision concerning allowability of the claims would be postponed pending consideration of this paper.

The pending claims were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) for being obvious in view of a Loprete-Suzuki-TaeDuk-Hix combination. Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection for the following reasons.

The Loprete patent discloses changing the direction of a compressor to vary the cooling capacity required by an air conditioning system. (column 4, lines 30-44). The direction of the

compressor may be changed based on a temperature sensor (thermostat, column 25, lines 9-22) or based on the external climate of the system (column 26, lines 47-54).

The Suzuki patent discloses varying the range of a temperature sensor.

However, neither patent teaches or suggests the features added by amendment to claim 2, including “detecting a current rotation direction of the compressor” before and as a pre-requisite of “setting an operation range of a temperature sensor that senses a temperature inside the refrigerator according to the detected current rotation direction of the compressor, the operation range of the temperature sensor set to a first temperature of the refrigerator range when the current rotation direction of the compressor is detected to be in a first rotation direction, and the operation range of the temperature sensor set to a second temperature range of the refrigerator different from the first temperature range when the current rotation direction of the compressor is detected to be in a second rotation direction.” (See, for example, pages 25 and 26 of the specification for support).

In contrast to claim 1, the Suzuki patent discloses setting the operational range of a temperature sensor based on whether the temperature sensor is to be used to control operation of a fire detection system or an air condition system. (See column 1, lines 5-37).

The operational temperature ranges of the fire detection system and air condition system are drastically different, i.e., 10 to 30° C for the air conditioning system and 40 to 90° C for the fire detection system. Thus, the sensor is changed based on whether it is serving the needs of the fire system or air condition system. The operational range of the sensor is changed by comparing the output of a reference voltage generating section to a voltage of a temperature detection

system. Based on this comparison, the temperature range of the sensor is set to one of the aforementioned ranges. (Column 3, lines 6-27).

In contrast to claim 1, the Suzuki patent does not detect the rotational direction of a compressor as a condition to setting the temperature range of its sensor. Moreover, the Suzuki patent does not teach or suggest setting its temperature sensor to two different ranges of a refrigerator based on the detected rotational direction. Instead, Suzuki adjusts its temperature sensor to either an air conditioner range or a fire detection range.

The Hix and TaeDuk patents also fail to teach or suggest these features.

Based on these differences, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 2 is allowable over the cited references, whether those references are taken alone or in combination. Furtherance of claim 2 and its dependent claims to allowance is respectfully requested.

In addition to the foregoing differences, claim 2 further recites “controlling the cooling capacity of the compressor based on whether the temperature inside the refrigerator is detected to be in the first temperature range or the second temperature range.” These features are also not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



Carol L. Druzbeck, Esq.
Registration No. 40,287

Samuel W. Ntiros
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 DYK/SWN/krf
Date: October 25, 2010

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610

\\Fk4\Documents\2000\2000-946\248067.doc